

Reply to Office Action dated July 18, 2008

REMARKS

Claims 10, 12, 68 and 71-72 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 10 and 68 are amended. Various amendments are made for clarity and are unrelated to issues of patentability.

The Office Action rejects claims 10 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. It is respectfully submitted that the above amendments obviate the grounds for rejection. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Office Action rejects claims 10 and 68 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent 6,324,522 to Peterson et al. (hereafter Peterson) in view of U.S. Patent 6,963,849 to Chaturvedi et al. (hereafter Chaturvedi). The Office Action also rejects claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Peterson in view of U.S. Patent 5,963,915 to Kirsch. Still further, the Office Action rejects claims 71-72 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Peterson in view of U.S. Patent 6,085,171 to Leonard et al. (hereafter Leonard). The rejections are respectfully traversed with respect to the pending claims.

Independent claim 10 recites a database server, a web server, and an order control server. Independent claim 10 also recites that the order control server is configured to restrict prescribed orders for each of the dealing companies based on information about the respective dealing companies, wherein the information of the respective dealing companies used to restrict prescribed orders relates to past performances of the corresponding dealing companies. Independent claim 10 also recites that order control server to obtain information about product order errors and to determine whether a product order error associated with a tangible product

Reply to Office Action dated July 18, 2008

in a received order is correct, wherein the product order error is obtained from a previously established error list that specifically identifies bad dealing companies that have committed trading errors.

The applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 10. More specifically, the Office Action (on pages 5-8) states that Peterson does not disclose a database server storing credit information for each of the plurality of dealing companies and the information of the respective dealing companies used to restrict prescribed orders relates to past performances of the corresponding dealing companies, and wherein the product error orders obtained from a previously established error list that identifies dealing companies having bad errors. The Office Action then cites Chaturvedi as alleging teaching the missing features. The Office Action states that Chaturvedi teaches that ratings or other performance information may be stored. The Office Action also cites Chaturvedi's FIG. 4, step 108 as disclosing determining whether an error exists.

Applicants respectfully submit that Chaturvedi's FIG. 4 specifically relates to set up information. See, for example, col. 12, lines 35-45 discussing that set up information may include items available from a supplier, collaboration activities in which the supplier will participate, information about existing contracts, communications information to communicate ratings, data files, or other appropriate information, credit-related information, payment-related information, or other suitable set up information. This does not teach or suggest a previously established error list that specifically identifies bad dealing companies that have committed trading errors. In FIG. 4, step 108, a determination is made whether an error of the set-up information exists and then

Reply to Office Action dated July 18, 2008

an error log is generated and communicated to a supplier. There is no teaching or suggestion that this error corresponds to a previously established error list that specifically identifies bad dealing companies that have committed trading errors. Rather, the error in FIG. 4 is used to validate an aspect of the set information. Thus, “errors” in step 108 do not correspond to bad dealing companies that have committed trading errors. Furthermore, the errors that are identified do not teach or suggest a previously established error list.

Further, Chaturvedi specifically discusses that ratings and performance information may be provided to reflect performance of a partner for a transaction. However, as is described throughout the disclosure, the ratings relate to specific numbers, such as 4.5 on a 5 point scale. See, for example, col. 8, lines 4-7 and lines 36-40. Chaturvedi does not teach or suggest a previously established error list that specifically identifies bad dealing companies that have committed trading errors. Rather, Chaturvedi relates to a specific ranking for each supplier.

For at least these reasons, Peterson and Chaturvedi do not teach or suggest all the features of independent claim 10. The other applied references do not teach or suggest the features of independent claim 10 missing from Peterson and Chaturvedi. Thus, independent claim 10 defines patentable subject matter.

Independent claim 68 recites an order control server, the order control server obtaining information about the tangible products in the received orders and any associated product order errors stored in the database server, the order control server determining whether a product order error associated with a tangible product in the received orders is correct and executing a selective order control in accordance with the determination. Independent claim 68 further

Reply to Office Action dated July 18, 2008

recites the product order errors are obtained by the order control server from a previously established error list in the database server, and wherein the product order errors in the previously established error list comprise dealing companies specifically listed as a bad trading company based on past errors.

For at least similar reasons as set forth above, the applied references do not teach or suggest at least these features of independent claim 68. More specifically, Chaturvedi does not teach or suggest that the product order errors in the previously established error list comprise dealing companies specifically listed as a bad trading company based on past errors. The other applied references do not teach or suggest these missing features. Thus, independent claim 68 defines patentable subject matter.

For at least the reasons set forth above, each of independent claims 10 and 68 defines patentable subject matter. Each of the dependent claims depends from one of the independent claims and therefore defines patentable subject matter at least for this reason. In addition, the dependent claims recite features that further and independently distinguish over the applied references.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Favorable consideration and prompt allowance of claims 10, 12, 68 and 71-72 are earnestly solicited. If the Examiner believes that any additional changes would place the application in better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below.

Serial No. **09/998,412**

Docket No. **K-0345**

Reply to Office Action dated July 18, 2008

To the extent necessary, a petition for an extension of time under 37 C.F.R. 1.136 is hereby made. Please charge any shortage in fees due in connection with the filing of this, concurrent and future replies, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account 16-0607 and please credit any excess fees to such deposit account.

Respectfully submitted,
KED & ASSOCIATES, LLP



David C. Oren

Registration No. 38,694

P.O. Box 221200

Chantilly, Virginia 20153-1200

(703) 766-3777 DCO/kah

Date: October 20, 2008

Please direct all correspondence to Customer Number 34610